



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,846	01/08/2002	Moti Haimovsky	37360	4483
26327	7590	11/10/2004	EXAMINER CHEN, TSE W	
THE LAW OFFICE OF KIRK D. WILLIAMS 1234 S. OGDEN ST. DENVER, CO 80210			ART UNIT 2116	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/042,846

Applicant(s)

HAIMOVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Tse Chen

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01082002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 8, 2002 was filed before the mailing date of the first Office Action. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 2, 8, 11, 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- As per claim 2, “apparatus of claim 2” should be “apparatus of claim 1”.
  - As per claim 8, “second remote image” on line 6 should be “second remote boot image”.
  - As per claim 11, “to the access first remote boot” should be “to access the first remote boot”.
  - As per claim 16, “the master controller” should be “the master system controller”.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2116

4. Claims 1-3, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rahman et al., US Patent 5539890, hereinafter Rahman.

5. In re claim 1, Rahman discloses an apparatus [processor system 10] comprising:

- A master system [microprocessor 12(0), maintenance diagnostic chip 14, and other associated circuitries/units such as memory 22].
- A slave system [microprocessor 12(1) and other associated circuitries/units] including a programmable interface [processor interface chip 16] coupled to the master system [fig.1; col.2, ll.42-61].
- A storage mechanism [memory 22, memory interface chip 20, and other associated circuitries/units], external to and coupled to the programmable interface, for storing a remote boot image [fig.1; col.10, ll.17-41].
- Wherein the master system is configured to update the programmable interface to retrieve the remote boot image [col.9, l.36 – col.10, l.41; mdc 14 updates register 220 in pic 16 to indicate where to retrieve boot image].

6. As to claim 2, Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein the storage mechanism is a memory [22] [col.2, ll.42-53].

7. As to claim 3, Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein the master system includes the storage mechanism [12(1) and 22 are part of master system] [col.3, ll.7-59].

8. In re claim 20, Rahman discloses an apparatus [processor system 10] comprising:

- Means for redirecting a boot operation of a remote system [microprocessor 12(1) and other associated circuitries/units] [col.9, l.36 – col.10, l.41; mdc 14 updates register 220 in pic 16 to indicate where to retrieve boot image].

Art Unit: 2116

- Means for storing a remote boot image [col.10, ll.17-41; memory 22 and other associated circuitries/units].
- Means for providing the remote boot image to the remote system [col.1, 1.56 – col.2, 1.9; col.5, 1.59 – col.6, 1.5].

9. As to claim 21, Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein said means for redirecting [pic 16] and said means for storing are included in separate systems of the apparatus [fig.1; col.2, ll.42-61].

10. As to claim 22, Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein said means for storing the remote boot image includes a file server [memory 22] [col.10, ll.17-41; boot codes are files].

11. Claims 13-14, 18-19, 23-25, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haigh et al., US Publication 20020087854, hereinafter Haigh.

12. In re claim 13, Haigh discloses a method comprising:

- Booting a master system [host 101] [pt.0026].
- Programming a slave controller to [code 218] to relay a boot request [command 214] from a slave processor [single board computer 100] to a master system controller [device driver 228] [pt.0025, 0029].
- Programming the master system controller to relay the boot request to a storage mechanism [disk 201] [pt.0029].
- Programming the master system controller to relay a boot image from the storage mechanism to the slave controller [pt.0029-30].
- Programming the slave controller to relay the boot image to the slave processor or memory associated with the slave processor [pt.0030].

- Booting the slave processor with the boot image [pt.0031].

13. As to claim 14, Haigh discloses the method wherein said programming the slave controller to relay the boot request includes assigning one or more addresses to the slave controller [pt.25,30; address is needed to send information back to slave].

14. As to claim 18, Haigh discloses the method comprising determining a corresponding boot software for the slave processor [pt.0022-24, 0033].

15. As to claim 19, Haigh discloses the method comprising identifying the slave processor [pt.0029; identify the slave in order to retrieve an forward information].

16. In re claim 23, Haigh discloses an apparatus [fig.1-3] comprising:

- A first remote system [sbc 303] including a first means for booting [pt.0023-25, 0033-34].
- A second remote system [sbc 304] including a second means for booting [pt.0023-25, 0033-34].
- A master system [sbc 302] coupled to the first and second remote systems, the master system including [fig.3];
- Means for storing a first remote boot image and a second remote image [disk 301; pt.0022—23, 0033-34; disk portions store associated sbc images].
- Means for redirecting a boot operation of the first remote system to the first remote boot image [pt.0022-25, 29, 33-36; 302 retrieves image from disk portion associated with sbc].
- Means for redirecting a boot operation of a second remote system to the second remote boot image [pt.0022-25, 29, 33-36; 302 retrieves image from disk portion associated with sbc].

Art Unit: 2116

17. In re claim 24, Haigh discloses a method comprising:

- Means for booting a master system [host 101] [pt.0026].
- Means for programming a slave controller to [code 218] to relay a boot request [command 214] from a slave processor [single board computer 100] to a master system controller [device driver 228] [pt.0025, 0029].
- Means for programming the master system controller to relay the boot request to a storage mechanism [disk 201] [pt.0029].
- Means for programming the master system controller to relay a boot image from the storage mechanism to the slave controller [pt.0029-30].
- Means for programming the slave controller to relay the boot image to the slave processor or memory associated with the slave processor [pt.0030].
- Means for booting the slave processor with the boot image [pt.0031].

18. As to claim 25, Haigh discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 14 and 24.

19. As to claim 28, Haigh discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 18 and 24.

20. As to claim 29, Haigh discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 19 and 24.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2116

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 4-5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahman as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Haigh.

23. In re claim 4, Rahman discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 3. In particular, Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein the programmable interface [16] includes a system controller [boot address relocater 194] and wherein the master system is configured to update the system controller [col.9, ll.36-65]. Rahman did not discuss redirecting a boot image retrieval request from the slave system to the master system.

24. Haigh discloses an apparatus [fig.1] wherein the programmable interface [bus master interface 230] includes a system controller [code 218] to redirect a boot image retrieval request [command 214] from the slave system [client 100] to the master system [host 101] [pt.0025].

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rahman and Haigh before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus taught by Rahman to include the system controller taught by Haigh, in order to obtain the apparatus wherein the programmable interface includes a system controller and wherein the master system is configured to update the system controller to redirect a boot image retrieval request from the slave system to the master system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce overhead and maintenance in a network system [Haigh: pt.0003-0016].

26. As to claim 5, Haigh discloses the apparatus wherein the master system [101] includes a master system controller [device driver 228] and wherein the master system is further configured



to program the master system controller to redirect the boot image retrieval request to the storage mechanism [disk 201] [pt.0029].

27. As to claim 7, Haigh discloses the apparatus comprising a boot image server [101] coupled to the programmable interface [230] and wherein the boot image server includes the storage mechanism [201] [fig.2; pt.0020-0023].

28. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rahman to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jones et al., US Patent 6757759, hereinafter Jones.

29. Rahman discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 1. Rahman did not discuss a second slave system.

30. Jones discloses an apparatus [fig.1] comprising a second slave system [cpu 13] coupled to the programmable interface [link 30 and associated circuitries/units] and wherein the second slave system includes a storage mechanism [local memory 120] [col.13, ll.1-52].

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rahman and Jones before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus taught by Rahman to include the second slave system taught by Jones, in order to obtain the apparatus comprising a second slave system coupled to the programmable interface and wherein the second slave system includes a storage mechanism. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to run multiple concurrent operations [Jones: col.14, ll.1-49].

32. Claims 8-12, 16-17, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haigh in view of Rahman.

33. In re claim 8, Haigh discloses an apparatus [fig.1-3] comprising:

Art Unit: 2116

- A master system [sbc 302] including a storage mechanism [disk 301] for storing a first remote boot image and a second remote boot image [pt.0022—23, 0033-34; disk portions store associated sbc images].
  - A first slave system [sbc 303] including a first programmable interface [bmi 320 and associated circuitries/units] coupled to the master system [pt.0034].
  - A second slave system [sbc 304] including a second programmable interface [bmi 320 and associated circuitries/units] coupled to the master system [pt.0034].
  - Wherein the master system is configured to retrieve the first remote boot image [pt.0022-23, 29, 33-36; 302 retrieves image from disk portion associated with sbc].
  - Wherein the master system is configured to retrieve the second remote boot image [pt.0022-23, 29, 33-36; 302 retrieves image from disk portion associated with sbc].
34. Haigh did not discuss the details of retrieving the different remote boot images.
35. Rahman discloses an apparatus [processor system 10] comprising:
- A master system [microprocessor 12(0), maintenance diagnostic chip 14, and other associated circuitries/units such as memory 22] including a storage mechanism [memory 22, memory interface chip 20, and other associated circuitries/units] for storing a remote boot image [fig.1; col.10, ll.17-41].
  - Wherein the master system is configured to update a programmable interface to retrieve the remote boot image [col.9, l.36 – col.10, l.41; mdc 14 updates register 220 in pic 16 to indicate where to retrieve boot image].
36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rahman and Haigh before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus

Art Unit: 2116

taught by Haigh to include the system controller taught by Rahman, in order to obtain the apparatus comprising a master system including a storage mechanism for storing a first remote boot image and a second remote boot image wherein the master system is configured to update the first/second programmable interface to retrieve the first/second remote boot image. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce overhead and maintenance in a network system [Haigh: pt.0003-0016].

37. As to claim 9, Rahman and Haigh disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 4 and 8.

38. In particular, Haigh discloses the apparatus wherein the first programmable interface [bmi 320 and associated circuitries/units] includes a first system controller [code 218 associated with first slave system] to redirect a first boot image retrieval request [command 214 associated with first slave system] from the first slave system [sbc 303] to the master system [sbc 302] [pt.0025] while Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein the programmable interface [16] includes a system controller [boot address relocater 194] and wherein the master system is configured to update the system controller [col.9, ll.36-65].

39. As to claim 10, Rahman and Haigh disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 4 and 8.

40. In particular, Haigh discloses the apparatus wherein the second programmable interface [bmi 320 and associated circuitries/units] includes a second system controller [code 218 associated with second slave system] to redirect a first boot image retrieval request [command 214 associated with second slave system] from the second slave system [sbc 304] to the master system [sbc 302] [pt.0025] while Rahman discloses the apparatus wherein the programmable

Art Unit: 2116

interface [16] includes a system controller [boot address relocater 194] and wherein the master system is configured to update the system controller [col.9, ll.36-65].

41. As to claim 11, Haigh and Rahman disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 5 and 8. In particular, Haigh discloses the apparatus wherein the master system [101, 302] includes a master system controller [device driver 228] and wherein the master system is further configured to program the master system controller to redirect the first boot image retrieval request to access the first remote boot image in the storage mechanism [disk 201] [pt.0029].

42. As to claim 12, Haigh and Rahman disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 5 and 11. In particular, Haigh discloses the master system [101, 302] that is further configured to program the master system controller [device driver 228] to redirect the second boot image retrieval request to access the second remote boot image in the storage mechanism [disk 201] [pt.0029].

43. In re claim 16, Haigh discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 13. Haigh did not discuss the details of the master controller.

44. Rahman discloses the method wherein a programming of the master system controller [boot address relocater 194] to relay the boot request includes programming the master system controller to redirect slave boot addresses [col.9, l.36 – col.10, l.41; change register 220].

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rahman and Haigh before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the apparatus taught by Haigh to include the teachings of Rahman, in order to obtain the method wherein a programming of the master system controller to relay the boot request includes programming the

Art Unit: 2116

master system controller to redirect slave boot addresses. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce overhead and maintenance in a network system [Haigh: pt.0003-0016].

46. In re claim 17, Haigh discloses each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 13. Haigh did not discuss a reset condition.

47. Rahman discloses the method comprising releasing [deasserting] the slave processor [microprocessor 12(1)] from a reset condition [col.5, l.65 – col.6, l.5].

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rahman and Haigh before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Rahman as the reset is a well-known condition used in an apparatus of Haigh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reset a system for booting [Jones: col.13, ll.1-52].

49. As to claim 27, Haigh and Jones disclose each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claims 16 and 24.

50. Claims 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haigh as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Jones.

51. In re claim 15, Haigh discloses each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claim 13. Haigh did not discuss the details of the slave controller.

52. Jones discloses the method wherein a programming of the slave controller [associated circuitries/units of cpu 12 or 13] to relay a boot request includes programming the slave controller to allow access to one or more internal registers [119] of the slave controller [col.13, ll.1-52].

Art Unit: 2116

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Haigh and Jones before him at the time the invention was made, to use the teachings of Jones for the slave controller disclosed by Haigh as the accessing of internal registers is a well known way to transfer information in an apparatus of Haigh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to transfer information between systems [Jones: col.13, ll.1-52; e.g., target boot address].

54. As to claim 26, Haigh and Jones disclose each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claims 15 and 24.

### *Conclusion*

55. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additionally cited U.S. patent documents describe various methods and systems for remote booting including various well-known concepts in the art.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2116

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tse Chen  
November 5, 2004



REHANA PERVEEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER